

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Drawings

Formal drawings are being submitted with the amendment to overcome the objections made in the Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review of 12/28/1999.

Claim Rejections

The Examiner rejected pending claims 1-24 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over Ault (US 6,338,064). Applicants traverse. Applicants have amended claims 1, 9, 17 and 2, 10, 18 to remove grammatical errors.

Claims 1, 9, 17

Independent claims 1, 9, and 17 provide a method, system, and article of manufacture for accessing a control system in a server from a client computer, wherein the control system includes a logon program to enable the client computer to use a terminal emulation program to logon to the server to access a client process executing in the server to perform control system operations, further comprising:

requesting, with the client, security context for the client including authorization to allow the client to access control system functions in the server;

returning, with the server, the requested security context to the client; and

transmitting, with a client program executing in the client, a control system command and the security context to access the control system in the server.

The Examiner has rejected the independent claims 1, 9, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over Ault (Office Action Page 2). The cited Ault (col. 4, lines 27-34, 39-42, 45-48)

discusses accepting a client request at a server. The client request contains an authorization information that is analyzed by the server. The server determines if the client can retrieve a document and if the client can retrieve the document then the server sends the document to the client.

The claims require requesting with the client a security context for the client, returning with the server the security context to the client, and transmitting from the client the security context and a control system command to access the control system in the server.

The Examiner found that col. 4, lines 27-34 of the cited Ault discloses the claim requirement of requesting with the client, security context for the client including authorization to allow the client to access control system functions in the server. Col. 4, lines 27-34 of the cited Ault discusses that the server accepts a client request and returns a response. Col. 4, lines 27-34 of the cited Ault further discusses that the operation of the server is governed by a number of functions executed in a certain sequence. The first function in the sequence is an authorization translation during which the server translates any authorization information sent by the client into a user and a group. Nowhere does the cited Ault (col. 4, lines 27-34) disclose the claim requirement of requesting with the client, security context for the client including authorization to allow the client to access control system functions in the server. In contrast, the cited Ault (col. 4, lines 27-34) discusses how the server performs a certain sequence of functions in the server on receiving a request from the client and not the requirement of requesting with the client, security context for the client including authorization to allow the client to access control system functions in the server as claimed.

The Examiner found that col. 4, lines 39-42 of the cited Ault discloses the claim requirement of returning with the server the requested security context to the client. Col. 4, lines 39-42 of the cited Ault discusses that the server performs various steps to determine if the client may retrieve a document. Nowhere does the cited Ault (col. 4, lines 39-42) disclose the claim requirement of returning with the server the requested security context to the client. In contrast, the cited Ault (col. 4, lines 39-42)

discusses how the server determines whether a client may retrieve a document and not the requirement of returning with the server the requested security context to the client as claimed.

The Examiner found that col. 4, lines 45-48 of the cited Ault discloses the claim requirement of transmitting, with a client program executing in the client, a control system command and the security context to access the control system in the server. Col. 4, lines 45-48 of the cited Ault discusses that the server selects an internal server function to send a result back to the client. Nowhere, does the cited Ault (col. 4, lines 45-48) disclose the claim requirement of transmitting, with a client program executing in the client, a control system command and the security context to access the control system in the server. In contrast, the cited Ault (col. 4, lines 45-48) discusses how the server sends a result back to the client. Nowhere does the cited Ault disclose the claim requirement that the client sends a control system command and the security context to access the control system in the server.

Therefore, nowhere does the cite Ault disclose the claim requirements of requesting with the client a security context for the client, returning with the server the security context to the client, and transmitting from the client the security context and a control system command to access the control system in the server.

Further, the claims require that the control system includes a logon program to enable the client computer to use a terminal emulation program to logon to the server to access a client process executing in the server to perform control system operations. Nowhere does the cited Ault discuss the claim requirement that the control system includes a logon program to enable the client computer to use a terminal emulation program to logon to the server to access a client process executing in the server to perform control system operations, in combination with the claim requirements of requesting with the client a security context for the client, returning with the server the security context to the client, and transmitting from the client the security context and a control system command to access the control system in the server.

For the above reasons, claims 1, 9, and 17 are patentable over the cited Ault, because the cited Ault does not disclose all the claim limitations.

Claims 2-8, 10-16, 18-24

The Examiner has also rejected pending claims 2-8, 10-16, 18-24 that depend on the pending independent claims 1, 9, and 17 respectively. Applicants submit that these claims are patentable over the cited art because they depend from claims 1, 9, 17 respectively which are patentable over the cited art for the reason discussed above, and because the combination of the limitations in the dependent claims 2-8, 10-16, 18-24 and the base and intervening claims from which they depend provide further grounds of distinction over the cited art

Claims 2, 10, 18

Claims 2, 10, and 18 depend from claims 1, 9 and 17 respectively and further require that requesting the security client comprises the client requesting the server to impersonate the client to obtain the security context, further comprising accessing, with the server impersonating the client, the security context to return to the client.

The claims require that the client requests the server to obtain the security context by impersonating the client and returning the security context to the client.

The cited Ault (col. 6, lines 10-14; col. 7, lines 12-28) discusses the server impersonating the client. However, nowhere does the cited Ault disclose the claim requirement that the server impersonates the client for returning the security context to the client.

For the above reasons, claims 2, 10, and 18 are patentable over the cited Ault, because the cited Ault does not disclose all the claim limitations.

Claims 3, 11, and 19

Claims 3, 11, and 19 depend from claims 2, 10, and 18 respectively and further require that the Distributed Computing Environment (DCE) protocol is used to provide the client security context, wherein the client uses the sec_login_become_initiator DCE command to request the server to impersonate the client, wherein the server uses the sec_login_become_impersonator DCE command to impersonate the client to obtain the security context.

The claims require the client to use the sec_login_become_initiator DCE command to request the server to impersonate the client, wherein the server uses the sec_login_become_impersonator DCE command to impersonate the client to obtain the security context.

The cited Ault (col. 7, lines 54-58, 60-67; col. 8, lines 1-19) discusses how the server impersonates the client within the DCE protocol and further discusses login commands. Nowhere does the cited Ault disclose the claim requirement of the client using the sec_login_become_initiator DCE command to request the server to impersonate the client, wherein the server uses the sec_login_become_impersonator DCE command to impersonate the client to obtain the security context.

For the above reasons, claims 3, 11, and 19 are patentable over the cited Ault, because the cited Ault does not disclose all the claim limitations.

Claims 4, 12, and 20

Claims 4, 12, and 20 depend from claims 1, 9 and 17 respectively and further require converting, with the server, the security context transmitted through the client program to a pointer to credential information of the client;

determining from the credential information, with the server, whether the client is authorized to invoke the transmitted control system command; and

executing, with the server, the control system command transmitted by the client if the client is authorized to invoke the command.

The claims require converting the security context transmitted through the client program to a pointer to a credential information of the client. The cited Ault (col. 7, lines 30-43) discusses whether the user identity of a thread corresponding to the client has any associated credential. If so, access is granted to the client. Nowhere does the cited Ault disclose the claim requirement of converting the security context transmitted through the client program to a pointer to a credential information of the client.

For the above reasons, claims 4, 12, and 20 are patentable over the cited Ault, because the cited Ault does not disclose all the claim limitations.

Claims 6, 14, and 22

Claims 6, 14, and 22 depend from claims 1, 9 and 17 respectively and further require that the client requests the security context through a remote procedure call.

The cited Ault (col. 5, lines 37-42; col. 6, lines 42-44) discusses a Web server component running on the server that provides various security and other function and also discusses how the server plug-in component on the server calls the session manager through a remote procedure call. Nowhere does the cited Ault disclose the claim requirement that the client requests the security context through a remote procedure call.

For the above reasons, claims 6, 14, and 22 are patentable over the cited Ault, because the cited Ault does not disclose all the claim limitations.

Claims 8, 16, and 24

Claims 8, 16, and 24 depend from claims 7, 15, and 23 respectively and further require that the printer system manager command transmitted by the client comprises a command to reconfigure at least one printer object, thereby allowing the client computer to perform administrative functions.

The cited Ault (col. 7, lines 44-49) discusses that the server returns the request file to the client to complete servicing of the original requests. A routine then continues with the server returning the user identity back to the session manager pool and the server making a remote procedure call to release the user. Nowhere does the cited Ault disclose the claim requirement that the printer system manager command transmitted by the client comprises a command to reconfigure at least one printer object, thereby allowing the client computer to perform administrative functions.

For the above reasons, claims 8, 16, and 24 are patentable over the cited Ault, because the cited Ault does not disclose all the claim limitations.

Conclusion

For all the above reasons, Applicant submits that the pending claims 1-24 are patentable over the art of record. Applicants have not added any claims. Nonetheless, should any additional fees be required, please charge Deposit Account No. 50-0585.

The attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact him at (310) 553-7977 if the Examiner believes such contact would advance the prosecution of the case.

Dated: August 7, 2003

By: Rabindranath Dutta

Rabindranath Dutta
Registration No. 51,010

Please direct all correspondences to:

David Victor
Konrad Raynes Victor & Mann, LLP
315 South Beverly Drive, Ste. 210
Beverly Hills, CA 90212

Amdt. dated August 7, 2003
Reply to Office action of 05/07/2003

Serial No. 09/409,633
Docket No. BO999025
Firm No. 0036.0039

Tel: 310-553-7977
Fax: 310-556-7984